

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

**DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

In Re: PAR PHARMACEUTICAL  
SECURITIES LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:  
ALL ACTIONS.

**Master File No:  
2:06-cv-03226 (PGS - ES)**

**CLASS ACTION**

**NOTICE OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
TO DISMISS LEAD PLAINTIFFS' SECOND  
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED COMPLAINT**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT, on a Motion Day to be determined by this Court in accordance with the Stipulation and Order, entered August 8, 2008, Defendants Par Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc. ("Par"), Kenneth I. Sawyer ("Sawyer"), Dennis J. O'Connor ("O'Connor"), and Scott L. Tarriff ("Tarriff") (collectively, "Defendants")<sup>1</sup> shall move this Court for an Order dismissing Lead Plaintiffs' ("Plaintiffs") Second Consolidated Amended Complaint ("Second Complaint") for failure to plead with particularity pursuant to Rule 9(b) and the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act ("PSLRA"), and for failure to state a

<sup>1</sup> In their First Complaint, Plaintiffs named Mark Auerbach as an individual defendant in this action. In the Second Complaint, Plaintiffs have dropped any claims against Mark Auerbach. Accordingly, in this motion Sawyer, O'Connor, and Tarriff are collectively referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). More specifically, Plaintiffs' Second Complaint should be dismissed because: (1) Plaintiffs have failed to adequately allege a cogent or compelling inference of scienter as to each of the Defendants, as required by the PSLRA; (2) Plaintiffs have failed to adequately plead loss causation; (3) many of the alleged misstatements are true, mere puffery, or forward looking statements; and (4) Plaintiffs have failed to plead control person liability because they fail to allege culpable participation by any of the Individual Defendants. Indeed, the Second Complaint is devoid of any individualized allegations, and, instead, pleads that all of the Defendants' "must have known" of the "fraud." Such allegations do not state a claim as a matter of law.

For these reasons and for all the reasons detailed in Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of their Motion to Dismiss the Second Complaint With Prejudice, and in the Declarations of Richard A. Edlin in support thereof, the Second Complaint must be dismissed in its entirety.

DATED: September 17, 2008

**GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP**

By: /s/ Richard A. Edlin  
Richard A. Edlin  
Eric S. Aronson  
Ronald D. Lefton (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Toby S. Soli (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
200 Park Avenue, P.O. Box 677  
Florham Park, NJ 07932-0677  
Telephone: (973) 360-7900  
Facsimile: (973) 301-8410

[edlinr@gtlaw.com](mailto:edlinr@gtlaw.com)  
[aronsone@gtlaw.com](mailto:aronsone@gtlaw.com)

-and-

200 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10166  
Telephone: (212) 801-9200  
Facsimile: (212) 801-6400  
[leftonr@gtlaw.com](mailto:leftonr@gtlaw.com)  
[solit@gtlaw.com](mailto:solit@gtlaw.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Par  
Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc.,  
Kenneth Sawyer, and Dennis J.  
O'Connor*

**PEPPER HAMILTON LLP**

By: /s/ Frank C. Razzano  
Frank C. Razzano (admitted in New Jersey)  
600 14th Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 220-1286  
Facsimile: (202) 202-1665

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Scott L. Tarriff*